DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 196 CS 001 996

AUTHOR	McDonald, Cheryl; Hylton, John A.
TITLE	Tryout and Evaluation of Prototype LMS (Learning Mastery System) Training System Under Exclusive Use Agreement.
INSTITUTION	Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Los Alamitos, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	SWRL-TN-5-71-64
PUB DATE	Aug 71
NOTE	36p.; See related documents CS001997-002002
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Objectives; Evaluation Methods; Grade 1; *Instructional Materials; Learning Activities; Primary Education; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Reading Skills; *Teaching Methods; Teaching Models
IDENTIFIERS	*Learning Mastery Systems

ABSTRACT

In 1970-1971 Learning Mastery System (LMS) materials were made available to schools within the state of California under an Exclusive Use Agreement. The LMS is a set of materials and procedures prepared by the Southwest Regional Laboratory (SWRL) as an objectives-based framework to assist in managing the learning activities of existing reading programs and materials. Thirty-six districts, including a total of 988 classrooms, were involved. To meet the user training requirement, a prototype training system was developed. This document summarizes the evaluation of the prototype LMS training system for Harper & Row grade-one and MacMillan Bank Street grade-one reading programs, including the evaluation procedures and instrumentation used, as well as a summary of the findings. (Author/RB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED108196

SWRL

SOUTHWEST REGIONAL LABORATORY TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 18, 1971

NO: TN 5-71-64

TITLE: TRYOUT AND EVALUATION OF PROTOYPE LMS TRAINING SYSTEM UNDER EXCLUSIVE USE AGREEMENT

AUTHORS: Cheryl McDonald and John Hylton

ABSTRACT

In 1970-1971 LMS materials were made available to schools within the state of California under an Exclusive Use Agreement. Thirty-six districts including a total of 988 classrooms were involved. To meet the user training requirement, a protoype training system was developed.

This document summarizes the evaluation of the protoype LMS training system for Harper & Row and MacMillan Bank Street, grade 1, including the evaluation procedures and instrumentation used, as well as a summary of the findings.

CSUDI 996

This document is intended for internal staff distribution and use. Permission to reprint or quote from this working document, wholly or in part, should be obtained from SWRL, 11300 La Cienega Boulevard, Inglewood, California, 90304.

TRYOUT AND EVALUATION OF PROTOTYPE LMS TRAINING SYSTEM UNDER EXCLUSIVE USE AGREEMENT

The Learning Mastery System (LMS) is a set of materials and procedures prepared by the Southwest Regional Laboratory as a supplement to the Harper & Row and MacMillan Bank Street first grade reading programs. LMS identifies the learning outcomes taught in the reading programs, and provides assessment and practice materials related to the outcomes identified. LMS is not a new reading program, but an objectives-based framework to assist in managing the learning activities of existing instructional materials.

LMS materials for Harper & Row and MacMillan Bank Street, grade 1, were made available to 36 school districts for use during the 1970-71 school year under an Exclusive Use Agreement. Included in the Laboratory's responsibilities was the provision of the training materials and procedures necessary to train teachers in the appropriate use of the LMS materials. Specifications for the development of the LMS training system have been reported previously (TN 5-71-63).

This document reports the data collected for formative evaluation of the training system using the 1970-71 Exclusive Use Agreement tryout as a vehicle.

TRAINER TRAINING

Training sessions, conducted by SWRL personnel, were held at the Laboratory for approximately 115 district trainers representing the 36 school districts participating in the tryout (see Appendix A).

The training program was designed to equip these trainers, selected by each district, to conduct training for all teachers using LMS. Figure 1 lists, and briefly describes, each of the components for both trainer and teacher training.

In addition to the stated objectives for which the teacher training components had been developed, the trainer training sessions were intended to: (1) provide basic information about the program; and (2) present and clarify trainer functions related to teacher training. Figure 2 is an agenda of the Training Session.

FIGURE I

TRAINING COMPONENTS

LEARNING MASTERY SYSTEM

Laboratory Overview (filmstrip-tape)

A brief description of the Laboratory, its function and goals.

Trainer's Packet (printed materials)

Guideline information on planning, scheduling, and conducting teacher training contained in the following enclosures:

Scheduling the Teacher Training Program

Considerations in planning the Teacher Training Program with specific suggestions and sample forms and agenda.

Trainer's Guide

A detailed summary of the steps to follow both immediately before and while conducting the training session.

District Planning Considerations

A number of considerations are listed to assist in identifying additional activities which require planning and scheduling.

The Learning Mastery System (filmstrip-tape)

An introduction to the basic elements and rationale of the program.

Manual and Materials Overview (audiotape)

An introduction and explanation of the materials and procedures used in the program.

Teacher Training Kits (sample materials)

Criterion Exercise, Unit 3
Class Record Sheet
Teacher's Manual
Auxiliary Exercise, Unit 3
Practice Exercise, Unit 3

Scoring, Recording, and Assigning Additional Practice (printed exercise)

Sample Criterion Exercise results and a Class Record Sheet requiring

teachers to review the procedures involved in scoring and recording.

LMS Question-Answer Sheet (printed material)

A summary of frequently asked questions and corresponding answers.

FIGURE 2

TRAINER TRAINING
AGENDA
LEARNING MASTERY SYSTEM

I. General Orientation

A. Welcome and Introduction

B. Laboratory Overview (filmstrip)

C. Overview of Trainer Responsibilities

D. Break

II. LMS Teacher Training Session

A. Introduction

B. LMS Overview (filmstrip)

C. Manual and Materials Overview (tape and teacher kits)

D. Scoring, Recording, and Assigning Additional Practice (exercise)

E. Question-Answer Sheet and Discussion

D. Break

III. Discussion of LMS Trainer's Responsibilities

A. Distribution and Check of Training Materials

B. Review of Trainer's Pesponsibilities (Trainer's Packet)

C. Reaction Sheet

As indicated in Figure 2, the training session was organized into three parts. Throughout the session, the SWRL trainers followed a Staff Trainer's Guide which provided introductions for each of the audio-visual components and a listing of informational items to be mentioned. In Part I of the training session, an overview of the trainer's responsibilities and resources, participants were shown the Laboratory Overview filmstrip and given a brief description of each of the items included in the Trainer's Packet. During Part II, the LMS Teacher Training Session, Laboratory personnel assumed the role of district trainers using the Trainer's Guide, and provided basic program information. Part III provided a more thorough review of trainer responsibilities and a number of options available to the districts regarding special installation and training procedures were discussed.

DATA COLLECTION

Four primary data sources were identified for the evaluation of trainer training: observations of trainer training sessions, trainer response to trainer training, observations of teacher training sessions and trainer interviews.

Observations of Trainer Training Sessions

SWRL staff members conducted observations of two LMS Trainer Training Sessions held at the Laboratory. The observations were designed to record the information trainers received in the training session and to identify additional information required, as suggested by the

questions asked by the participants. The observation checklist, (see Appendix B) was based upon information which had been sequentially extracted from the Staff Trainer's Guide.

Trainer Reactions to Trainer Training

Reaction Sheets, prepared by the Division of Resource Services, were intended to poll participant response to the training session and to elicit any questions, problems, or suggestions which may not have been dealt with during the session itself.

Observation of Teacher Training Sessions

As for trainer training, observations were made by SWRL personnel of eight Teacher Training Sessions, conducted in five local school districts. Pre-selected aspects of trainer performance extracted from the Trainer's Guide were recorded using the observation form (see Appendix D). Questions and comments made by the participants were recorded to help point out areas of confusion. The observer's subjective assessment of participant reaction to the training session and the quality of training components were also noted.

Trainer Interviews

In March, 1971, SWRL staff members conducted personal interviews with district trainers in seven local school districts who maintained close contact with teachers throughout the year. Each interview consisted of a series of specific questions (see Appendix E) and any additional comments or suggestions made by the coordinators. The inter-

views were intended to elicit further responses from trainers based on their evaluation of the teacher training system and the training they received from SWRL to conduct teacher training, and teacher reactions to training.

TEACHER TRAINING

Training for the approximately 988 teachers in the 36 districts using LMS with Harper & Row and/or MacMillan Bank Street, grade 1 reading programs, were conducted by district trainers. Figure 3 is an agenda of the Teacher Training Session.

FIGURE 3

LMS Teacher Training Agenda

Welcome and Introductions

Learning Mastery System

(filmstrip and tape)

Manual and Materials Overview

(tape)

Scoring, Recording, and Assigning Additional Practice

(manual and exercise)

Question-Answer Sheet

Briefing on District Requirements, Schedule, Resource Personnel, and Materials Distributions

Discussion and Questions

To introduce teachers to the basic elements and rationale of the program, the filmstrip-tape, The Learning Mastery System, was used. Teacher Training Kits, distributed at the session, were reviewed in conjunction with the Manual and Materials Overview audiotape. Teachers using the MacMillan Bank Street version of LMS were instructed, by the trainer, in the procedures for administering the Placement Test. This information was not included in the tape review based on the Harper & Row materials.

At the conclusion of the materials review, the teachers were asked to complete the Scoring, Recording, and Assigning Additional Practice exercise, which enabled them to practice the Criterion Exercise procedures.

The LMS Question-Answer Sheet served as the basis of the question-answer period. Trainers were given the option of reading this information to teachers or merely sending it home with the teachers.

DATA COLLECTION

Two sources were identified for evaluation of the teacher training system: observations of the training system, and instructional pacing data.

Observations of Teacher Training Sessions

SWRL observations of the eight Teacher Training Sessions described above resulted in the recording of questions and comments made by teachers, as well as trainer performance data. The questions and comments, are summarized in Appendix F.

Instructional Pacing Data

Under the Exclusive Use Agreement, pacing and performance data were collected by SWRL throughout the year from 101 schools in sixteen districts (Los Angeles zones are recorded as distinct districts) using LMS. Four pacing and performance status reports (January, April, May and June, 1971) were issued.

RESULTS

Data collected from the two Trainer Training Sessions which were observed indicated that district trainers received most of the information required to successfully conduct Teacher Training. The observer checked each item as it occurred and recorded, verbatim, questions asked by the participants. Appendix D is a summary of these observations. Of the important information not mentioned by the SWRL trainer during the sessions, the following had implications for improved trainer training.

1. If the trainer is assisted by an audiovisual aide, he should be provided with a copy of the Trainer's Guide.
2. The trainer has the option of reading or paraphrasing component introductions, if he chooses to paraphrase he should include all of the points mentioned in the written introduction.
3. The SWRL staff trainer was to have explained the role of placement tests and the pacing requirements of the program.
4. The advisability of follow-up training sessions is mentioned in the trainer materials, but was to have been emphasized in the Trainer Training Session.

The responses of district representatives recorded on the Reaction Sheets at the conclusion of each of the seven LMS Trainer Training Sessions (see Appendix C), have been reported by Lasser (TN 4-70-14). The Reaction Sheets were completed at the conclusion of each LMS Trainer Training Session and immediately returned to the SWRL trainer. Ninety-four percent of the respondents indicated they felt prepared to conduct training for others given their training and additional time to review the materials. When asked what specific modifications in materials they would make, 64 percent had none. Of the remaining 36 percent, only the suggestions that materials be numbered sequentially, and that terms be more clearly defined, recurred consistently. Sixty percent of the participants felt no change was necessary in the procedures or sequencing of the training session. The modifications most frequently suggested by the remaining 40 percent were: (1) slower pace, allowing time for questions as they arose and time to review the materials more thoroughly; and (2) an opportunity to review the materials prior to the training session.

Table 1 summarizes trainer performance data gathered from the observations of Teacher Training Sessions. Trainers did perform almost all required behaviors during the training session. The exception involved those who chose to paraphrase the introductions to components and did not mention the important points contained in the written introductions. These important points were mentioned in only 69 percent of the 41 introductions paraphrased, adequate sound, visibility, and room

darkness were maintained in all but one case (here, the recorder had to be turned so loud that the words were unclear).

While the subjective comments of the SWRL observers at these Teacher Training Sessions (see Appendix F) dealt primarily with teacher reactions and the quality of audiovisual components, they also note deviations from the training system procedures. Two trainers, during the Manual and Materials Overview tape, stopped the tape recorder to allow time for all teachers to locate the referenced materials and to answer questions. At one training session the filmstrip-tape component, Second Year Communications Skills Program - Word Attack, was shown to give teachers practice in Word Attack skills and SWRL pronunciation of selected word elements.

The following are areas with the highest frequency of questions asked by teachers during the Teacher Training Sessions observed by SWRL personnel.

1. The amount of time required by the program (4)
2. Confusion as to the purpose and use of Practice Exercises (7)
3. What to do about slow children and the pacing schedule (3)

Reports during teacher meetings and phone inquiries from the districts identify pacing as the major concern of teachers.

Pacing information was gathered from 63 schools in eleven districts using LMS with Harper & Row, grade 1, and 38 schools in five districts using LMS with MacMillan Bank Street, grade 1, under the Laboratory's Quality Assurance Plan. One district area (Los Angeles C - five schools) stopped submitting data after the initial pacing and performance report. Teachers

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF TEACHER TRAINING OBSERVATIONS*

	Yes		No	
	#	%	#	%
1. The trainer should secure for the training sessions, facilities with:				
a. adequate sound levels	14	88	1	6
b. means for darkening the room	8	100	0	0
c. seating so that each teacher has a clear view of the screen	8	100	0	0
2. The trainer will introduce each training component by either reading or paraphrasing the given introduction.				
a. read component introduction	29	41	41	59
b. if paraphrasing the component introduction, the trainer will mention all important points	64	69	28	30
3. The trainer will synchronize the advancement of filmstrips and tape narration.	8	100	0	0
4. The trainer may advise teachers as to specific district provisions regarding:				
a. press releases	0	0	4	50
b. follow-up training	3	38	3	38
c. resource personnel	4	50	2	25
d. materials distribution	3	38	2	25
e. other	0	0	2	25

*n=8

were directed to mail Criterion and Auxiliary Exercises to SWRL when a majority of the children had completed a unit. The reported unit-completion dates were matched against a schedule reflecting the recommended pacing. Only three percent of the Harper & Row classes, and none of the MacMillan Bank Street classes monitored, had completed the textbook series by the end of the year.

The results of the interviews with district coordinator/trainers have been summarized by Puckett and Resta (TN 5-71-21). Of those interviewed, three of the trainers indicated they had problems with the LMS training system. One trainer mentioned that teachers found the directions for scoring the Criterion Exercises difficult. A second trainer felt that considerable negative teacher affect could be attributed to the lack of a statement of rationale for the program and to the absence of training in SWRL blending, or word attack, procedures. The third trainer's only difficulty was in an initial shortage of materials which was corrected before conducting the training sessions.

CONCLUSION

Available data indicated that the LMS trainer training system did meet the objectives set for it. Appropriate facilities were arranged and the training sessions presented as specified in the trainer training materials.

Teachers indicated they felt rushed into learning a new concept and new terms in the short session. Teachers also suggested that word attack instruction would be a valuable addition to the program.

The data collected from teachers, while useful, did not answer the questions regarding training adequately enough to justify revisions based solely on the data. The teacher feedback reported was in general, unsolicited, and far from inclusive of the problems noted. In addition, there is no objective measure of teacher performance, as there is for district trainers. These data will be necessary for a valid evaluation and revision of the LMS Teacher Training System.

APPENDIX A

LMS 1970-71 PARTICIPANTS

DISTRICT	No. of TRAINERS	No. of TEACHERS
ABC		3
Anaheim	2	35
Bakersfield	4	25
Barstow		1
Beverly Hills	1	3
Chula Vista	4	40
Cuyama	1	1
El Monte	2	16
El Segundo	3	4
Escondido	5	20
Fullerton	2	6
Hanford	2	5
Hermosa Beach	3	5
Hueneme	4	9
L.A. City	36	600
Lancaster	2	11
Long Beach	2	2
Moreno Valley	2	8
Mountain View	2	10
National City	3	8
Newport Mesa		20
Oceanside	2	18
Oceanview	2	44
Oxnard	3	11
Palm Springs	4	12
Palos Verdes	1	16
Redondo Beach	2	15
Rowland	3	20
San Bernardino	2	50
San Diego		180
Santa Monica		12
Santa Paula	4	8
Savanna	3	7
Simi Valley	4	26
Torrance	1	24
Valley Oaks	4	13
Total 36	115	988

APPENDIX B

LMS Trainer Training Observation Check List

	Occured or Mentioned YES	NO	Neither Marked
1. Welcome and Introduction	2		
2. Laboratory Overview (filmstrip)	2		
3. Overview of LMS			
a. Harper and Row materials only	1	1	
b. Similar to Bank Street	1	1	
4. Review of trainer's packet			
a. Trainer's agenda--organizational rationale	1		1
b. Role change at section II (trainers act as teachers)	1	1	
c. Discussion section is for questions	1		1
d. Think of questions that teachers will ask		1	1
5. Trainers packet			
a. It answers most questions		1	1
b. It is a step by step guide		1	1
c. Developed by SWRL and district experience	1	1	
d. Pull overview	2		
6. LMS Trainer's guide			
a. Walk through check list	2		
b. Note that this is where role change occurs	1	1	
c. Recommend assistant for AV	2		
d. Give assistant copy of trainer's guide	1	1	
e. Practice, if possible		1	1
f. Explain component section	1		
g. Option of reading or paraphrasing introductions	1	1	
h. Go through trainer's guide to end of teacher training section	2		

7.	LMS Overview (filmstrip-tape)			
	a. Explain placement tests and pacing	1	1	___
	b. No more than 2-3 weeks on readiness	1	1	___
	c. Need to complete many units because more skills taught as go along	1	___	1
8.	Manual and Materials Overview (tape)			
	a. Hand out teacher kits	2	___	___
	b. Stop tape as necessary	2	___	___
	c. Hold up documents	2	___	___
	d. Point out error	2	___	___
9.	Scoring, Recording and Assigning Additional Practice			
	a. Relationship of rows to outcomes	1	1	___
	b. Refer to page 13	2	___	___
	c. Review recording on CRS	2	___	___
	d. Use correct Practice Exercises	1	1	___
10.	Question and Answer Sheet			
	a. Discussion	2	___	___
11.	Question Period	2	___	___
12.	Discussion of trainer responsibilities			
	a. Establishing location and dates of training session	2	___	___
	b. Notification of participants	1	1	___
	c. Assignment of materials coordinator (district and school)	2	___	___
	d. Make-up training	1	1	___
	e. Provision of resource person	2	___	___
	f. Training review session	2	___	___

13. Reaction Sheet

14. Distribution of Training Materials

a. Teacher lists	2	___	___
b. AV will be mailed	2	___	___

APPENDIX C

REACTIONS TO TRAINING SESSION

1. On the basis of today's session and with additional time to study and review the materials, are you prepared to train others in the proper use of this Program?

   Yes____ No____

   If your answer is YES, ...

   If your answer is NO, what specific assistance would be helpful?

2. Please rank the activities listed below from 1 (most) to 3 (least) in terms of the amount of time you anticipate you will spend in review and study prior to training teachers:

   _____ a. Manual and Materials Overview

   _____ b. Assessment and Review

   _____ c. General Instructional Procedures

3. What specific modifications would you suggest in the training materials used in today's session?

4. What specific suggestions would you make to improve the procedures or sequencing of the presentations in today's session?

OPTIONAL

What kind of further assistance, if any, do you feel you need from the Laboratory?

If you would like to schedule an appointment to meet with a representative of the Laboratory to receive this assistance, please complete the following:

_____
Name

_____
District

_____
Address

_____
Telephone Number

APPENDIX D

LEARNING MASTERY SYSTEM TEACHER TRAINING
OBSERVATION DATA SUMMARY

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

A. Welcome

1. pleasant? yes 8 no ____

2. positive? yes 8 no ____

B. Introduction

1. read? ____ paraphrased? 8

If paraphrased, were the following points mentioned?

a. purpose to acquaint with organization, content, and procedures of LMS? yes 6 no 2

b. film describes rationale for program development? yes 4 no 4

c. SWRL produced it? yes 6 no 2

d. an adjunct to regular first-grade reading program, not an instructional program? yes 7 no 1

II. LEARNING MASTERY SYSTEM

A. Introduction

1. read? 1 paraphrased? 7

If paraphrased, were the following points mentioned?

a. describes LMS to accompany Harper & Row and MacMillan Bank Street first-grade reading program? yes 5 no 2

b. how LMS differs from textbook material? yes 1 no 6

B. Filmstrip and Tape

1. adequate sound level — yes 7 no 1

2. adequate visibility? — yes 8 no ____

3. adequate darkness? — yes 8 no ____

4. film and tape in synchronization? — yes 8 no ____

III. MANUAL AND MATERIALS OVERVIEW

A. Introduction

1. read? 2 paraphrased? 6

If paraphrased, were the following points mentioned?

a. training kit is to familiarize you with contents of Teacher's Manual? — yes 5 no 1 not mentioned ____

b. also to familiarize you with program material? — yes 3 no 3 not mentioned ____

c. scoring, recording, and assigning additonal practice and question-answer — yes 3 no 2 not mentioned 1

B. Tape

1. adequate sound level? — yes 7 no ____ not mentioned 1

2. adequate pace that allowed participants to follow tape? — yes 5 no 2 not mentioned 1

3. were all participants following along with the tape? — yes 5 no 1 not mentioned 2

IV. SCORING, RECORDING, AND ASSIGNING ADDITIONAL PRACTICE

A. Introduction

1. read? 1 paraphrased? 7

If paraphrased, were the following points mentioned?

a. quick practice of procedures to use of each unit. — yes 5 no 2

b. procedures include scoring a Criterion Exercise, recording scores on the Class Record Sheet, and if Practice Exercises are required. yes 6 no 1

V. QUESTION-ANSWER SHEET

A. Introduction

1. read? 3 paraphrased? 5

If paraphrased, were the following points mentioned?

a. provides common questions concerning LMS? yes 4 no 1

b. helpful in describing to others? yes 4 no 1

c. also may suggest additional questions yes 5 no ____

VI. Were any provisions made in the following areas?

A. district press release? yes ____ no 4 not mentioned 4

B. follow-up training? yes 3 no 3 not mentioned 2

C. resource personnel? yes 4 no 2 not mentioned 2

D. materials distribution? yes 3 no 2 not mentioned 3

E. OTHER: yes ____ no 2 not mentioned 6

_____

_____

APPENDIX E

INSTALLATION SYSTEM QUESTIONS
INTERVIEWS (PERSON TO PERSON)

Questions 1 through 4 apply only to those who did not conduct teacher training.

1. Did any problems arise for which your training or printed materials did not prepare you?

_____

_____

_____

2. Are there any changes you would make in the training materials or the way you were trained? (Scheduling the Training Session, Trainer's Guide, District Planning Considerations)

_____

_____

_____

3. Are there any specific questions about the program which you have been unable to answer for teachers? (If so, what are they?)

_____

_____

_____

4. Did you experience any difficulties in the manner in which the teacher training materials were acquired and disseminated? (If so, what were they?)

_____

_____

_____

5. Has SWRL's program had an effect on any other part of your instructional program? (i.e., have non-SWRL participants become interested in objectives based curricula or criterion referenced assessment?)

_____

_____

_____

6. Has SWRL's program caused any reactions from the teachers? parents? community? (If "yes," begin a,b,c,d)

a. What are they?

Teachers: _____

_____

Parents: _____

_____

Community _____

_____

b. Which negative ones have continued throughout the entire year?

_____

_____

_____

c. Which negative ones disappeared early in the year?

_____

_____

_____

d. At what point did they disappear?

_____

_____

_____

7. What was your position in the district before taking the teacher trainer task?

_____

8. What is your position now?

_____

9. What other SWRL-related tasks do you perform besides teacher training? (If applicable)

_____

_____

_____

10. What other tasks do you perform in your district?

_____

_____

_____

11. Make a subjective judgement as to the interviewer's enthusiasm for the program.

1	2	3	4	5
very enthusiastic				very enthusiastic

APPENDIX F

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
LMS TEACHER TRAINING OBSERVATION *

I. Learning Mastery System

(c) Q. Do we use the program (LMS) with those not using McMillian readers?

A. Only those using Harper and Row and Bank Street. All children in the class do not have to use LMS.

(f) Q. How much time is allotted to this program?

A. Normal amount

(f) Q. Does it correlate with our follow-up program?

A. No response

(g) Q. I don't have aides. How can we use the program?

A. It was designed with the single teacher in mind.

(a) Q. What amount of time will it take?

A. Two hours per unit.

II. Manual and Materials Overview

(e) Q. Where are the answere for the Practice Exercises and Auxiliary Exercises?

A. In the manual.

(g) Q. How are Auxiliary Exercises different from Practice Exercises?

A. No response

(b) Q. If you use mothers to help with Practice Exercises, do they have to stay all day?

A. No. A mother could come in for 15 minutes and drill a child.

* letters in parenthesis signify trainig session listed at end of Appendix

(g) Q. How do you find answers to Auziliary Exercises?

A. No response.

III. Scoring, Recording, and Assigning Additional Practice

(a) Q. Can the Practice Exercise be given to a group?

A. They can be - also before a Criterion Exercise.

(a) Q. If a child misses "Janet" on Criterion Exercise, how will he know it on Practice Exercise?

A. You will have to teach the content.

(a) Q. What if instruction in Practice Exercise asks to read word #20 and child doesn't know word #20?

A. Each child goes through Practice Exercise twice, getting feedback each time.

(c) Q. Do you hold the whole class back until Practice Exercises have been given?

A. No, keep program going day by day.

IV. Questions Regarding Pacing

(a) Q. What about a slow child? Do we make him finish a unit in three weeks?

A. Assume they are developing readiness by other activities.

(a) Q. (Lots on pacing.)

A. These estimates are based on the average time 1st grade teachers took. You can group kids and go faster.

(c) Q. What happens when pupils do not "get it?"

A. After using Practice Exercises go on to the next unit.

(b) Q. Is it possible we could have one or two children who are really slow and lag behind?

A. Most children can keep up. You may have one or two, take more time with it.

V. General Questions

(b) Q. Are you going to bring Practice Exercise to us?

A. Yes, as you need them.

(c) Q. I am already through the preprimer. Do I start over and use LMS?

A. Give Criterion Exercises on those units covered and if they pass continue with LMS.

(e) Q. Will we have enough materials for all our children?

A. They are packaged 30 per pack.

(f) Q. Will we get a different manual for Bank Street?

A. Yes.

(f) Q. What happens when 2nd grade teachers used materials?

A. No response

OBSERVER COMMENTS
LMS TEACHER TRAINING OBSERVATION *

I. Learning Mastery System Welcome and Introduction

(b) Very pleasant, informed atmosphere. (2)

(a) Trainer stressed points of contract and that they should stick to pace.

(c) Very attentive for such a large group.

II. Learning Mastery System

(a) Tape awfully fast!

(b) Teacher kits were opened and gone through before they were introduced. Very attentive.

(d) Teachers were bored to death.

(d) Not enough placement tests - had to share them.

III. Manual and Materials Overview

(a) Trainer stops at spots in tape so teachers can ask questions or can jot down questions to be asked later. (2)

(b) Pace too rapid. Tape was not stopped as suggested. When it got to Criterion Exercise, many were still looking at the training lesson.

(a) Train substitutes and parents in the program.

(a) Trainer: Practice Exercises may be given during regular instruction. If you have kids who have a lot of trouble use P.E. before C.E.

(a) Terminology "Criterion Exercise" confusing.

(b) Immediate reaction of skepticism regarding suggested pacing. Stated they were overwhelmed!

(b) (c) (g) (h) Sample materials were held up by trainer and she added information.

* letters in parenthesis signify training session listed at the end of Appendix.

(c) Almost all teachers participated.

(d) Much confusion in finding the right C.E. It seemed to work better when two people shared the materials, not so much dropping of papers.

IV. Scoring, Recording, and Assigning Additional Practice

(g) Too complex for aides. Filmstrip wasn't a sufficient teaching device.

(b) Introduced rapidly. Some probably had questions that might have been answered before the exercise. Teachers did not understand the task asked of them. After five minutes trainer explained position of outcomes on Criterion Exercise. (2)

(a) Trainer calls auxiliary exercises, tests!

(c) After this exercise the CS II Word Attack Skills tape and filmstrip were presented. This was an effective addition to the LMS materials - perhaps the General Instructional Procedures Filmstrip should be shown with LMS, too.

(c) All of the teachers did not do the scoring, recording exercise. There may not have been enough to give each teacher one.

(d) Most frequently asked - Why score 8? Rows across need more explanation.

V. Learning Mastery System Question - Answer Sheet

(b) Trainer read questions and answer too. Teachers were told that everyone is to be started in the program by 10/5.

(c) Surprisingly, very few questions were asked.

(b) In general - questions were not particularly encouraged. Everyone was tired and wanted to go home.

LETTER CODE

a.	San Bernardino	9-16-70
b.	Mountain View	9-17-70
c.	Rowland Unified	9-22-70
d.	Torrance	9-28-70
e.	Los Angeles - B	10-12-70
f.	Los Angeles - B	10-12-70
g.	Los Angeles - B	10-15-70
h.	Los Angeles - B	10-16-70